

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Serial No. 10/759,252  
Attorney Docket No. 042039

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 3 and 5 are amended. Claim 4 is canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Pratt et al.* (U.S. 2003/0066930) (hereinafter “Pratt et al.”). Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 3 overcomes this rejection. It is believed that the Listing of Claims on page 2 distinguishes over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 3 is amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 4.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pratt et al.* In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner acknowledged that *Pratt et al.* does not disclose a center-folding door structure. However, the Examiner stated that it would have been obvious, as a matter of design choice, to have hinged the doors with respect to one another in either way. Applicants disagree. The mere fact that *Pratt et al.* may be modified in the manner suggested in the Office Action does not make the modification obvious unless *Pratt et al.* suggested the desirability of the modification. *In re Fritch*, 972 F. 2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In the above-identified application, the center-folding door structure was selected so that “the hinge 132 can be removed from the door body 110, and the crew inside the cockpit 3 can escape into the cabin through the opening 114” [page 10]. This hinge design enables an “emergency escape route” when the door body 110 fails to open for any reason. *Pratt et al.* does

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Serial No. 10/759,252  
Attorney Docket No. 042039

not recognize this problem. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is solicited because *Pratt et al.* does not teach the problem or its source.

As claim 5 depends from claim 3, it should likewise be allowable in light of the above comments in regard to the §103(a) rejection by nature of its dependency.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Darrin A. Auito

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 56,024

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA:ns

Q:\2004\042039\042039 Amend 12-27-04 OA.doc